UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,318	08/19/2003	Jaime Singson	OR03-04001	6010

			EXAMINER
51067	7590	03/07/2006	DARNO, PATRICK A

ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
c/o A. RICHARD PARK
2820 FIFTH STREET
DAVIS, CA 95616-2914

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/644,318	SINGSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrick A. Damo	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _19 August 2003_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _19 August 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _02222006_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-39 are pending in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 First Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2.   Claims 1-39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

With respect to claim 1, the claim cites "A method for facilitating data stewardship" but neither the claim nor the specification recites how this method is performed in order to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention. For example, "allowing a user to create metadata for use in the data warehouse system." This limitation states that a user is allowed to create metadata for use in a data warehouse system, however, neither the claim language nor the specification describe the particular method steps involved in creating metadata that would allow one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention. In order to present a reasonable prior art rejection, since no particular method of "creating metadata" was given, the examiner decided that any reference that recites a "user creating metadata" reads on this claim limitation (It is important to note that while only one limitation is cited here, all the limitations of claim 1 contain the same deficiency.).

With respect to claim 1, the claim appears to be directed to a method of delegating authority by an overall administrator (super user) to other users (data steward, collection/data administrator, or regular user). However, neither the claim nor the specification list the method steps in the process of delegating authority by an overall administrator to other users in order to allow one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention. In order to present a reasonable prior art rejection, since no particular method of delegating authority was given, the examiner decided that any reference discloses the delegating of authority by an overall administrator to other users reads on this claim limitation.

Claims 1, 14, and 27 are rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-39 are rejected because they either contain or inherit the deficiencies of claim 1, 14, or 27 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 Second Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 1-39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 1, the preamble states "A method for facilitating data stewardship" but the body of the claim does not recite the steps of a method for facilitating data stewardship. The claim recites an action a particular user can perform,

but does not recite the steps the user follows in order to actually perform that action.

For example, "allowing the super user to assign a data steward for the collection." This

limitation states that a super user is allowed to assign a data steward, however, the

limitation does not say that the super user actually does assign a data steward for the

collection, it does not say that the super user does not assign a data steward for the

collection, and most importantly it does not say how the super user assigns a data

steward for the collection if the super user does in fact decide to assign a data steward.

This uncertainty renders the claim indefinite. In order to overcome this rejection, each

limitation of this claim needs to be revised in order to first state the actual action or

operation that occurs (not just what is allowed to occur), and further each limitation of

this claim needs to state the individual method steps required to required to carry out

each action or operation set forth in the limitations such that one of ordinary skill in the

art would be able to make and use the invention. In order to present a reasonable prior

art rejection of the application, the examiner simply assumes that the super user has the

authority to grant different levels of permission (or access) to different users.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 14 and 27 are rejected under the same reasons as set forth in the

rejection of claim 1. Appropriate correction is required

Claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-39 are rejected because they either contain or inherit

the deficiencies of claim 1, 14, or 27 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4.   Claims 1, 14, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they fail to

produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

With respect to claim 1, the claim is rejected because it contains limitations that

simply allow or permit actions to be performed. Nothing in the claim reflects if the actual

limitation that is allowed to be performed, is actually performed. Further, even if it is

assumed that the actual limitations are performed, there is no mention of a useful,

concrete, and tangible result that occurs tying the limitations together to achieve a

method for facilitating data stewardship. The claim language must recite the actual

steps involved in the method and further the claim language must recite a useful,

concrete, and tangible result. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 14 and 27 are rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection

of claim 1.

Claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-39 are rejected because they either inherit or contain

the deficiencies of claims 1, 14, and 27 respectively.

5.   Claims 14-26 are rejected because the cited computer readable medium includes

nonstatutory subject matter.

With respect to claim 14, the cited computer readable medium contains computer

instruction signals, carrier waves, and transmission mediums. Transmission mediums

such as signals and carrier waves represent physical characteristics of a form of energy

that do not fall within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in 35

U.S.C. 101. Because forms of transmission mediums such as signals and carrier

waves do not fall within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in

35. U.S.C. 101, the claims are rejected. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 15-26 are rejected because they contain or inherit the deficiencies of

claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claim 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent Application Publication Number 2005/0033726 issued to Ju Wu et al. (hereinafter

"Wu").

Claim 1:

Wu discloses a method for facilitating data stewardship for metadata in a data

warehouse system, comprising:

allowing a user to create metadata for use in the data warehouse system (Wu:

paragraph [0035]; Note specifically lines 8-10, "end users employing a metadata consumer access

business views." This shows that the users access the actual data with the aid of metadata. Then on lines

13-16 the phrase "At each level, business users responsible for preparing mapped data....". This

preparing of mapped data is the creation of metadata for use in a data warehouse system.);

allowing a super user to move the metadata into and out of a collection (Wu:

paragraphs [0034] and [0037]; The data foundation is the collection. The word administrator as used in

this reference is a generic term that includes "regional managers", "data administrators", and "data

managers. This distinction can be made perfectly clear by reading Wu: paragraph [0037]. Paragraph

[0037] shows that the original data foundations are "created by regional managers". It further shows that

data administrators can "add the relevant data connections previously created". Finally, by the definition

of a data manager is one who handles, controls, or directs data. Paragraph [0034] shows that the regional

manager (or administrator or super user) creates the data foundation (collection) by using a GUI to select

tables and columns from a variety of data sources. This selecting of tables and columns from a variety of

data sources results in moving metadata into and out of a collection (data foundation). The data

foundation draws its data from columns and tables (normal operation in a relational database.). The

metadata is the data mapping and linking involved in connecting the columns and tables into a data

foundation (or collection).)

allowing the super user to assign a data steward for the collection (Wu: paragraph

[0037] and [0054], lines 1-4; The data stewards are the data managers referred to in paragraph [0037],

line 4. In paragraph [0037] it is important to note that all types of possible users claimed by the applicant

are also disclosed by Wu. The regional manager is the super user, the data manager is the data steward,

the data administrators are the collection administrators, and the users are simply the normal users. And

note in paragraph [0054] that the administrators (or regional manager or super user) control which tables

and columns that users can or cannot access. The only characteristic that distinguishes between

administrative users (super users, administrators, data stewards or managers, etc.) and regular users is the

level of access that a given user has to certain data. Since the administrative user here is allowed to

control access to all data, the administrative user can grant or assign a data steward for a given collection

by simply giving the user to be designated data steward the necessary access to the data in a given

collection (or data foundation).);

allowing the data steward to manipulate the metadata in the collection (Wu:

paragraph [0080]; Note that it is "possible for administrators to create and modify metadata service

objects." The administrator in this case would be the "data manager" (or data steward) given the correct

responsibilities by the overall administrator (regional manager) in order to manage a particular collection

(or data foundation).).

Claim 2:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further

discloses comprising allowing a collection administrator to move metadata into and out

of the collection (Wu: paragraph [0037]; Note particularly lines 13-15 of paragraph [0037] where the

data administrator is allowed to modify the relevant data connections (or metadata) originally set up by

the super user (or regional manager).).

Claim 3:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further

discloses wherein the data steward includes more than one individual (Wu: paragraph

[0037], line 4; This uses the plural form of the word "data manager". This means that there **must** be more

than one data steward.).

Claim 4:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further

discloses wherein manipulating the metadata includes editing and deleting the metadata

(Wu: paragraph [0080]; Modify means to alter. The word modify means to cause change or to make

different. It is clear by the context the word is used in that it includes editing, deleting, and possibly even creating. Once again the administrator reserves the right assign the proper access to data as the administrator sees fit (paragraph [0054]). What functions the users perform and to what degree the functions are performed are a design choice of the administrator.).

Claim 5:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further discloses wherein the collection is related to a specified domain (Wu: paragraph [0037]; Note that the collection (data foundation) is related to geographical regions. The domain is a geographical region.).

Claim 6:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further discloses wherein the data steward can be a data steward for more than one collection (Wu: paragraph [0054], lines 1-4; The overall administrator controls access all collections (data foundation). If the administrator wishes to grant control to multiple collections to one data manager (or data steward) the administrator can. However, doing so is simply a design choice.).

Claim 7:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further discloses wherein the super user has access to the metadata within a plurality of collections (Wu: paragraph [0054], lines 4-7; Note that the overall administrator creates the data foundations (has access to collections) for the whole enterprise. Then the business views of each portion of the enterprise are delegated to other users.).

Claim 8:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further

discloses wherein the metadata can include data descriptions (Wu: paragraph [0005], lines

6-12; This is the very definition of metadata. All metadata is a description of data.).

Claim 9:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further

discloses wherein the metadata can include procedures related to the data warehouse

system (Wu: paragraphs [0005] and [0011], lines 8-9; The metadata is used to deal with how the

information is collected and formatted. Further the metadata is used to create business views allowing

reporting and analysis of the information. Using metadata to create reports is a "procedure" as defined by

the applicant in paragraph [0037] of the applicant's specification.).

Claim 10:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further

discloses comprising:

allowing the user to create a new metadata; and

allowing the user to request that the new metadata be moved to the collection

(Wu: paragraph [0035] and [0054]; See rejection of claim 1 for further explanation of this paragraph.

Also note paragraph [0054], lines 1-4 where it is disclosed that the overall administrator grants access to

resources as the administrator sees fit.).

Claim 11:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further

discloses comprising allowing the user to manipulate metadata that the user owns and

that does not belong to the collection (Wu: paragraph [0035] and [0054]; Again the overall

administrator (or regional director or super user) has the authority to grant permission to a user to access a

given set of resources. The access to files is determined by the administrator (or super user) and is a

design choice.).

Claim 12:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further

discloses comprising allowing the data steward to create metadata within a folder in the

collection, wherein creating metadata within the folder automatically causes the

metadata to be added to the collection (Wu: paragraph [0035], [0037], and [0054]; Paragraph

[0035] discloses allowing a user to create metadata ("business elements", "mapped data", and "metadata

consumer access business views"). This is done while editing/creating a data foundation (collection).

And this collection must be in a folder (all computer files are in some sort of hierarchical grouping such

as a folder). So the edits/additions are created inside a folder and the metadata is added to the collection.

For any further explanation of the cited references see preceding rejections.).

Claim 13:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Wu further

discloses:

wherein only the super user can create/delete a collection;

wherein only the super user can update the collection by moving metadata

to/from the collection (Wu: paragraphs [0034] and [0037]; See rejection of claim 1 for further

explanation of these references.).

Claim 14:

Claim 14 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 1

and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 15:

Claim 15 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 2 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

Claim 16:

Claim 16 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 3 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 3.

Claim 17:

Claim 17 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 4 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim

Claim 18:

Claim 18 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 5 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

Claim 19:

Claim 19 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 6 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

Claim 20:

Claim 20 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 7 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

Claim 21:

Wu discloses all the elements of claim 14, as noted above, and Wu further discloses wherein more than one data steward can be a data steward for a specified collection (Wu: paragraph [0054], lines 1-4; The overall administrator controls access to all collections

(data foundation). If the administrator wishes to grant control to multiple collections to multiple data

managers (or data stewards) the administrator can. The administrator would simply grant necessary

access to the individuals the administrator desires to be data managers (or data stewards). However,

doing so is simply a design choice.).

Claim 22:

Claim 22 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 9

and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 9.

Claim 23:

Claim 23 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 10

and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 10.

Claim 24:

Claim 24 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 11

and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 11.

Claim 25:

Claim 25 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 12

and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 12.

Claim 26:

Claim 26 is a computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 13

and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 13.

Claim 27:

Claim 27 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 1 and is rejected

under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 28:

Claim 28 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 2 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

Claim 29:

Claim 29 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 3 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 3.

Claim 30:

Claim 30 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 4 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 4.

Claim 31:

Claim 31 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 5 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

Claim 32:

Claim 32 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 6 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

Claim 33:

Claim 33 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 7 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

Claim 34:

Claim 34 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 8 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

Claim 35:

Claim 35 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 9 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 9.

Claim 36:

Claim 36 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 10 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 10.

Claim 37:

Claim 37 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 11 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 11.

Claim 38:

Claim 38 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 12 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 12.

Claim 39:

Claim 39 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 13 and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 13.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick A. Darno whose telephone number is (571) 272-0788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Patrick A. Darno
Examiner
Art Unit 2163

***